

rejected claims 1, 5-8, 10-14, 18, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dealey et al. However, the elements recited on the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 of the Office Action do not appear to match up with the rejected claims. In another example, and in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dealey et al. in view of Dealey, Jr. Again, the elements recited on page 6 of the Office Action do not appear to match up with claims 15-17. In yet another example, and in paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2-4, but the statement for reasons of allowance do not appear to match up with claims 2-4.

The undersigned discussed the outstanding Office Action with the Examiner on May 12, 2003. The Examiner agreed that there was a problem with the Office Action. The Examiner suggested that Applicant provide this response, after which, the Examiner agreed to issue a new Non-Final Office Action.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes it would be beneficial to discuss the application or its examination in any way, please call the undersigned attorney at (612) 573-2002.

Date June 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Brian N. Tufte, Reg. No. 38,638
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC.
1221 Nicollet Avenue
Suite 800
Minneapolis, MN 55403-2420
Telephone: (612) 677-9050
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349

RECEIVED
JUL - 8 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800